

A STUDY IN EVOLUTION

By L. W. ROGERS



Price 25 Cents

A STUDY IN EVOLUTION

By L. W. ROGERS

THEO BOOK COMPANY

2006 N. Sayre Avenue

-

Chicago

A STUDY IN EVOLUTION

To the thoughtful student of human evolution a most impressive fact is that there is an unending succession of civilizations. They arise, grow strong, decay and finally pass away to be followed by others. It must be that these civilizations have been coming and going for unnumbered thousands of years and the historians can know but very few of them. They tell us of ancient civilizations known as the Chaldean, the Egyptian, the Persian, the Aztec, etc., to which they assign indefinite ages.

In due time each civilization perishes and gives place to the next—perishes and passes for one reason or another. It may be because its work is done and well done and farther progress for the souls that compose it is possible only in a better environment and a more complex life. It may be because it has not followed the course which alone can give it continued existence and useful experience; but sooner or later it leaves the stage to its successor just as spring gives way to summer and summer culminates in autumn; or, if it fails, just as that which is unsound, which is decaying, must give way before nature's reconstructive forces. No matter whether it is a small thing of local importance only or a mighty civilization filling the earth, that which is not in harmony with the foundation of the universe must

give way to that which is. However feeble may be the right it shall ultimately succeed; however mighty the wrong it shall finally fail.

“Truth crushed to earth shall rise again.
The eternal years of God are hers.
But Error, wounded, writhes in pain
And dies among her worshipers.”

That civilization which is growing in harmony with the *laws of our being* shall live long and accomplish much, while that which drifts, however unconsciously, into opposition to those laws, must perish. If it were not so, the race itself would cease to exist just as one's body must die if, whether consciously or unconsciously, it becomes the habitation of an unchecked, fatal disease.

To understand the evolution of civilization we must understand what a man is, what the race is, and how it evolves; for the evolution of a man outlines the evolution of the race, which is collective man. The infancy of a man corresponds to the savagery of the race. The maturity of a man corresponds to the completed evolution of the race.

Now, there is no magic process by which a child can become a man. Gradually his powers unfold—the physical first, then the mental. As a rule it is not till he is well on in adult life that the moral forces strongly assert themselves. This is so true that it is universally known that a large

majority of all criminals are very young. But whether criminal or not, whether of high type or low, every human being is, in his youth, at his best physically and at his worst morally. Every person in adulthood finds his intellectual powers touching their zenith while in advanced maturity it is the spiritual nature that comes fully into its own and dominates all. It is the triumph of spirit over matter. This formula of development in the individual—physical, then mental, then moral—is as fixed and invariable as the successive stages of infancy, youth and maturity.

Precisely so it is in the life of the race. In its evolution it runs the gamut of childhood, youth and maturity. Just as a child slowly learns to manage itself, the race slowly evolves the art of government. Government is, in essence, the management of the body politic, and its form necessarily corresponds to the state of evolution the race has reached. In the childhood of the race, which was its savage state, pure force governed. With the youth of the race intellect began to develop, complexity of life began to appear, the chieftain gave way to the king and the feudal age was at hand. But precisely as feudalism was only a stage in the evolution of the race our present civilization is but another stage that must as surely be transcended and thrown aside. Better forms

of government are ahead of us as certainly as worse ones have been left behind.

Force was the essence of the earliest forms of government—force and absolute outer authority. They are concomitants of childhood, whether of the individual or of the race. But as evolution proceeds the form of government necessarily changes. Absolute monarchy is followed by limited monarchy, by the growth of aristocracy. The circle of authority widens and becomes centered in a class instead of exclusively in a king.

It is idle to say that there should never have been any kings—that the people should always have governed themselves. Monarchy was an evolutionary development consistent with the childhood of the race. It served a purpose at a time. A man became a king because he was the man for the job. The job was serving the immediate interests of a great group of souls—a nation. To see that it is so, we have only to recall such monarchs as Cæsar, Charlemagne, or Peter the Great of Russia. They represented the collective interests of their people as certainly as a congressman represents the interests of his district. A thing that is perfectly right at one period of evolution may be absolutely wrong at another. Monarchy was the inevitable form of government in the childhood of the race. But that racial childhood has passed and monarchy is disappearing.

There is but one form of government consistent with the manhood of the race and that is a pure democracy. When the race was in its childhood there were no books, no press, no schools, no education. There was almost universal ignorance and superstition. Today there is almost universal education and intelligence.

There are really but three forms of government—monarchy, aristocracy and democracy. The race attains each of them as an individual attains childhood, youth and manhood. It's merely a matter of natural growth. But in the evolution of the race, old forms have to perish before new ones can be adopted. Monarchs seldom had wisdom equal to their power. They could not, or would not, recognize the fact that the people were becoming fitted for a larger degree of liberty. In opposing the growth of freedom they were in the position of a parent who insists that his son shall remain a child after he has grown up. They denied the right of self-government. Monarchy became tyranny. The reaction from tyranny was revolution, and revolution was, under the circumstances, the only road to democracy.

But what, from the evolutionary viewpoint, is democracy? It is the point in race evolution where it attains the ability to govern itself. It's the same thing for the race that it is for a young man to attain the age of twenty-one years, and be-

gin to manage for himself. It's the end of race youth and the beginning of race manhood.

The essence of democracy is liberty and responsibility. Without both there can be no progress. A child can not possibly become a man without liberty. As a child his liberty is limited and his course directed, but as he develops, his own will must come into use. He must learn to control himself, think for himself and act on his own responsibility. Otherwise he would never cease to be a child. He would become an infant mind in an adult body—a grown up baby that would live to no purpose.

In a monarchy the people have no part in affairs, no responsibility for conditions, no activity for the mind. The king thinks for all and decides for all. In a democracy all think and act and evolve. The beginning of democracy is the end of race childhood. Slavery was its cradle, serfdom was its kindergarten and democracy is its workshop.

Revolutionary war, in its essence, is the reaction from tyranny. It is the force that sweeps away the barriers to progress. Evolution produced monarchy. Monarchy developed into tyranny. Tyranny prevented human progress. It was an obstruction in the evolutionary stream and in exact proportion that the retarding obstruction grew, the opposing progressive force accumu-

lated. That mighty current of human force that has run counter to entrenched tyranny in western civilization is easily traced and identified. The great Magna Charta in England was the birth of democracy. Up to the time of that revolt against the absolute power of the monarchs, the question of life or death for every person was in the hands of the king and all subjects lived or died at his pleasure. The revolution in 1215 took that power from the king and established the right of trial by jury. In other words it was the beginning of the shifting of supreme authority from the king to the people.

Slowly that then new and great idea, that the people may think and decide for themselves, grew and permeated the civilized world. Nearly six centuries later the French Revolution completed what Magna Charta had begun. It did not succeed in immediately establishing a government of the people. Great evolutionary movements develop slowly and tyranny dies hard. But it finished the work in the realm of human consciousness. The belief in the divine right of kings had received its death blow. The prestige of the idea was gone forever.

The American Revolution was another great epoch in the coming democracy of the race. It went a step farther and made a practical demon-

stration of the fact that the people had evolved the ability for self-government.

Slowly, through the centuries, democracy—the power of the people—evolved and matured. Almost imperceptibly England changed from an absolute monarchy to the democracy it is today, with all the authority of government in the hands of the people. Switzerland developed and perfected a form of democracy that is a model for the world. Mexico and Central America shook off every vestige of royal authority. During the present generation South America cut the last tie with the kings of Europe, and democracy was triumphant on the whole of two great continents.

But also on the other three continents, the idea that the people shall rule marched triumphantly on. Portugal became a republic. Even China caught the spirit of progress, swept aside the world's oldest dynasty, and joined the swelling ranks of democracy.

The human race seems to have fully entered upon the third stage of the evolution of its civilization. The periods of childhood and youth lie behind us. The dawn of racial manhood is here. What, then, is ahead of us? Does modern civilization rest upon a sound and enduring foundation or will it also soon disappear from the scene to be numbered with other failures of the past?

What are the causes which lead to the de-

struction of a civilization? What are the laws of our being, the ignoring of which is fatal if long enough continued? They may all be summed up in one basic truth and that is the unity—the occult, the unseen, the unsuspected, but nevertheless the absolute unity—of all that lives. It is because of that unity that every injury of whatever nature that is inflicted upon another is, in its final result, an injury to the self. Just as under the law of gravity that which ascends must descend, so under the natural process of readjustment—the readjustment which preserves the race—that which is sent forth must return. A nation which is unjust will, in time, reap injustice simply because only thus can the disease of injustice be cured. A nation that lives by the sword shall perish by the sword because like attracts like and violence reacts upon the violent. When a nation representing a certain phase of civilization, for example like that of Rome, perishes, the process is analogous to surgery. It is like amputating a limb because gangrene has developed, for only thus can the body be saved.

What are the signs of ill health in our present-day civilization? To what extent are we following the course which Rome followed to her gradual decline and by which the much greater civilization of Atlantis brought upon itself swift annihilation? Unfortunately the symptoms of dis-

ease in our modern civilization are at a stage of development that gives ample grounds for anxiety. Two of these may be listed as, first, greed for wealth and power; second, intolerance of other nations and races.

Desire for worldly possessions is an almost universal thing and it arises naturally enough from the difficulty of sustaining life on the physical plane and of making it secure against possible future reverses. It easily grows into the vice of greed and it becomes a public danger when the individual possesses great executive ability, without equal development of conscience, or when it is organized into corporate bodies and thus forms the mechanism through which the avaricious forces of a large number of individuals can flow. It *may* then become an entity without soul or conscience because those whose fortunes it exists to make are too far removed from its operations to be personally affected by any distress it may cause.

In more ancient times the master came into contact with the slave who toiled to create wealth for him. The master knew the slave's circumstances and the conditions under which he worked. Personal observation of the hardships endured by the slave reacted in arousing sympathy in the master and in the consequent modification of the slave's conditions. Thus the wel-

fare of the slave was closely linked with the conscience of the master. Now the master is replaced by the investor who is far removed from the mine or factory. Only foremen come into direct contact with the toilers. The manager may know of hard conditions and long, exhausting hours and may have a sensitive conscience but the owners hold him responsible for dividends. His position depends not upon the welfare of the workers but upon the profits he can get for the stockholders who may be very kind and excellent people but who know no more of the conditions of those who thus indirectly work for them than they do of people on the opposite side of the earth. Under such circumstances their strong desire for gain may become, collectively, a tremendous but heartless force.

The corporation, like everything else, has its good and bad side, for nothing is ever wholly good or entirely bad. The corporation enables people to unite their separate forces into one gigantic power to accomplish what would be individually impossible. Such aggregations of power have been a potent factor in civilization, successfully conducting great enterprises that could not otherwise have been undertaken. It has also brought about production on a gigantic scale, which tends to lessen costs and should therefore raise the standard of living. The corporation is a

natural and necessary development in industry; but it is none the less a distinct source of danger, for while it unites the financial strength of thousands of individuals it completely separates the consciences of these individuals from the work that is done by their authority. Thus we have in the great corporation a source of danger that is peculiar to modern civilization. To be sure some corporations have instituted old age pensions, favorable opportunities for investments by employees, etc. Altruism of some degree is to be found everywhere, at every level of human affairs; but that does not change the principle previously stated—that conscience ceases to be effective when far removed from the conditions that it ought to regulate.

That, then, is the first count against our present-day civilization—that its complexity has led to the institution of the corporation through which, as it operates in industry, greed may express itself without the check of conscience. But unfortunately the trouble does not end there. Indeed it merely begins there in the *organization* of greed into a mighty mechanism of practically conscienceless accomplishment. But the point made here should not be misunderstood. It is not the use but the *misuse* of corporate power that is at fault. It is a distressing fact that success in the accumulation of wealth generally increases the

desire for greater possessions. The very large and rapidly growing number of enormously wealthy people throughout the world seems to indicate that no amount of money ever satisfies the average human being; and as the wealth increases many of the corporations unite in the huge combinations that are popularly called "trusts." Nearly all great commercial activities are covered by these trusts—railways, ships, telegraphs, telephones—each separate department of business such as steel, tin, lumber, light, power, etc. These great corporations have a community of interests, sentiments, and purposes. As wealth grows power increases. Clever lobbyists are sent to legislatures and to Congress. Laws are shaped to increase the already huge profits. All this finally creates an oligarchy of special privilege. Great newspapers, dominated by them, color events to suit their purposes and manufacture public opinion to order. This irresistible influence is felt more or less in the pulpits and in the courts and gradually, but certainly, the will of the oligarchy finally shapes the policy of a nation.

The various nations which make up our modern civilization as a whole are much alike. They differ only as members of a family differ from each other. For example, France, England, and the United States each have peculiar virtues and peculiar faults. No nation is in a position to do

very much preaching to any other. Its own faults are merely of different kind. The United States would not now invade and subjugate a weaker nation; but on the other hand there is no other nation among the great powers where mere money-making is so eagerly and persistently followed, where politics are so corrupt, where such gigantic legalized plundering goes on or where the powerful rich of the predatory type show such utter contempt for all laws made to restrain them.

In each of the nations of our modern civilization the one hopeful thing is that the masses of the people have a saving sense of justice and propriety, but public opinion is uninformed, befogged and uncertain of its course. The people's inherent right-mindedness is unorganized and ineffective and therefore the united oligarchies of the various nations dominate and control the entire world. As long as that is so war is an ever present specter creating fear and destroying all peace of mind; for while the plutocracies of all nations belong to a common school of thought and act in perfect concert in all matters that promote the general plutocratic interests, they are commercial rivals, competitors for markets. They use the polite language of diplomacy but they are like so many armed gamblers at a poker game. None trusts any other and each is always ready to use force to get what he is after. In that phase our

civilization presents precisely the difficulty that exists wherever there are two dogs and one bone. It does not cure the case to add another bone. It makes it worse. The strong dog wants that also. His mind does not connect with the desires of other dogs. It's too completely filled with the question of bones for himself! If there are a hundred bones the fight goes on just the same; not because a dog has any use for a hundred bones but because he can not see that other dogs have any business with any bones!

And so it is with the greed and jealousy of nations. In the earth is abundance for all and there will be wealth for all when triumphant democracy finally unites the people in the commonwealth of the world, with free access to the earth's resources.

Just here, let me make it clear that I am talking about the plutocratic governments of various nations, and not about the peoples of those nations. The governments of nations are constantly doing things which the people would never do if they had the opportunity to express themselves. There is no particular difference between the motives and the humanitarianism of the masses and the people in England, France, or the United States. It is their plutocratic governments, in each case, which are responsible for the atrocious things which are done. Astounding as the truth

is, it is none the less a fact that, in order to maintain the special privileges which they enjoy, the group of powerful business interests which shape the national policies, disregard all principles of justice and human rights. Therefore we see nations following a course that we would utterly condemn in individuals.

In a speech May 27, 1916, President Wilson said: "It is clear that nations must in the future be governed by the same high code of honor that we demand of individuals." What an indictment of our modern civilization!

Plutocratic governments of nations do that for which an individual would be unanimously condemned as a brute, a coward and an outlaw; and they do it for the same reason—simply because they have the power to do it and profit by it.

Rank hypocrisy is the natural companion of such greed. When a strong nation decides to invade a weaker one there is usually the effort to popularize the piracy by directing attention to some benefit accruing to the victim. The cloak of religion is often used to disguise the plundering. With a Bible in one hand and a gun in the other every injustice inflicted upon a weaker people is heralded to the world as a special act of benevolence. Under the plea of the necessity of protecting a weaker nation its territory is occupied, its people disarmed, its cities policed, forts

and flying bases are built, and that nation's revenues are taken to pay the bill. Sometimes it is a country that has oil, iron or coal; sometimes those that only have fertile soil and large harvests; sometimes those that are of strategic value; but always those countries are markets for the invading nation. Sometimes the protection is supposed to be against neighboring nations that might become greedy! Sometimes it is merely because the weaker nation owes an unpaid debt to the citizens who belong to the invading nation. Sometimes the excuse is actually to protect the weaker nation against itself! That is one plea on which India was denied home government. It was said that if a strong power did not maintain order the Mohammedans would fight the Hindus. We heard the same argument about Ireland a few years ago. It was said that that nation could not govern itself—that its people would be certain to fight each other because Irishmen *must* fight. Well, suppose they must; is it any worse to break each other's heads and destroy each other's property than to have somebody else do it for them? The theory that one people may govern another against their will because that nation is not fit for self-government is utterly pernicious. The simple truth is that no civilized people are fit for anything *but* self-government.

Nations have precisely the same right to man-

age their own affairs that families have. If the same practice that is followed by the plutocracy toward weak nations were introduced among families, we would see a powerful family taking charge of the affairs of a weaker one. The head of the strong family, observing that the head of the weaker family had more coal in the bin and oil in the basement than he thought was necessary for a family of that size, would say to him, "My friend, some of your unchristian neighbors are liable at any time to rob you. Moreover, your children fight with each other over trifles. Now, simply to protect you from others and to keep peace among the members of your family I am taking over most of your yard and part of your house; and in order that my honest labor and benevolent intentions may be properly rewarded I shall help myself to your coal and oil!"

To maintain its advantages the plutocracy finds no plea too foolish and no cruelty too great. Reflect for a moment on the Belgian atrocities in the Congo. One would be inclined to deny the facts as impossible to human beings if the whole thing were not a matter of record. One method by which the Belgian plutocracy got profits from the Congo was to require of a native village a certain amount of rubber which that village must obtain within a given time. The penalty for failure to obtain it was the loss of a

hand; and the magazines of about the year 1907 contained photographs of natives, one of whose hands had been chopped off by the swords of Belgian soldiers. At that time I was residing for several months in England, and I well remember how the pulpits of that country indignantly and rightfully thundered against those Belgian atrocities. They desired to stop the cruelties by arousing the conscience of the world; and that was the right thing to do. In India, some years later, General Dyer ordered his soldiers to fire upon a great assembly of unarmed and inoffensive citizens, and in a few minutes those shot to death probably outnumbered those who lost hands in the Belgian Congo. The good people of England were outspoken on that outrage. A great wave of indignation swept over that country and Dyer was dismissed; but observe what followed. The plutocracy could not keep him in an official position, but it subscribed to a consolation fund for him that amounted to a small fortune. Thus, the plutocracy gave notice to its agents everywhere that they would be well rewarded regardless of the indignation of the people. Is it any wonder that the same kind of shooting atrocity occurred later on in two cities in China? In Shanghai a peaceful parade of students was fired upon and a number were killed. Their only offense was that they were *suspected* of desiring

to make some unknown trouble! It reminds one of Mr. Dooley's remark to Mr. Hennessy, that if things kept on as they were going Mr. Hennessy was liable some day to be arrested for hoping to steal a ham!

A far worse thing occurred later in Canton. The French and other soldiers placed machine guns along a certain avenue. Several hundred Chinese students decided to walk peacefully and unarmed, of course, past the guns as a silent protest against this display of foreign military power in their country. When they were well before the guns the soldiers, without a word of warning, opened fire and those boys and girls were slain by scores. Estimates of those on the ground put the dead at several hundred. These young people were of the highest Chinese society, of the educated and the cultured business and professional families.

Aboard an Anglo-Indian steamer that was carrying a large number of civil and military officials from Europe to the Orient, a typical representative of the commercial interests was asked what he thought of giving a larger degree of freedom to Egypt and India. "I don't believe in it," he said quite frankly. "I am not raising the question," he continued, "of whether or not it is right for us to be there. But if we are to be there the only successful way is to be firm and

shoot." He reiterated the statement in different language but always put in the word "shoot" and made it emphatic; and from his viewpoint that policy is perfectly logical. Plundering by the plutocracy is not different in principle from plundering individually. The highwayman holds the same creed. He shoots. He terrorizes; and that was the reason and the only reason for the massacres in India and China—to let the people know that an ever-present and mighty power is ready to shoot and shoot to the death, regardless of age or sex. It is the frank recognition of an undeniable principle—that injustice which seriously endangers the victim's welfare can be maintained only by terrorizing—only by cruelty and intimidation.

We have, then, another charge to place against greed. Its natural and inevitable outgrowth is cruelty and brutality.

Let us go one step farther in the indictment of human greed. It paralyzes the conscience until it ceases to function at all. In the case of the corporation we saw that while the people for whom the corporation acts have consciences in normal condition, their consciences are nevertheless ineffective because they do not come into touch with the work being done for them. In the case of the leaders of the plutocracy, however, that is not so. The fact there is that they have

become hardened to the results of their work and no thought of the pain inflicted by their course deters them. No moral principle is allowed to turn them aside from the utmost profits that are possible. Of course there will be found in the plutocracy men with altruistic tendencies and occasionally the vicissitudes of politics bring into power a man who earnestly desires to improve the state of affairs. But all such men are helpless in the clutch of forces which they cannot control and their well-meant proposals are easily wrecked by the powerful interests opposed to them.

Absolute proof of this is furnished by the history of the efforts of Americans to gradually stop the production of opium in the Oriental countries that are controlled by the Christian nations of Europe. Alcohol is rightly regarded as one of the great evils of the world, but it is as nothing compared to the ravages of opium, for opium's destructive work is done on various planes—physical, emotional, and mental. It attacks and destroys the victim's will-power and thus the strongest man becomes merely an outward semblance of his former self. Opium paralyzes his conscience and turns him into a human wreck, a derelict on the sea of misfortune, a helpless and hopeless slave to a diabolical and resistless force. Opium is the open road to the one real hell, a path of pain, of nerve-racking torture, of emotional

agony, of insane hallucinations, of utter horror that only the victim can know and that even he cannot fully describe. Opium is as treacherous as it is terrible. It begins with the promise of all the joys of heaven and ends with all the agonies of hell.

Congress sent the Porter Commission on repeated journeys to Europe with the hope of getting an agreement with the interested nations—an agreement that would gradually reduce the production of opium ten per cent each year until within a decade it should be brought down to the minimum of what would be required by scientists and physicians. What was the result? At first a flat refusal to surrender the huge profits that come from that unholy trade! After persistent efforts over a period of many years, some progress has been made. Of course the opposition was put in the oily language of high diplomacy. The chief excuse was that it would not be fair to the poor opium producers of the Orient! The heart of plutocracy certainly does ache for the poor people of the Orient—when they are threatened with the loss of business which gives most of its profits to plutocracy! As a matter of fact, the Oriental cultivator of the soil just manages to exist no matter what he plants. His income, at the very best, is a few cents a day. Enormous profits are made from opium but they do not

reach the men and women who sow and reap the poppy fields.

Here we come to an extremely important but much misunderstood evolutionary truth. A popular error is the belief that intellect and spirituality are closely related. It is assumed that the more intelligent a man is the more spiritual he must be. But intellect is merely one mode of awareness. It has no relationship to spiritual development. A man may have a highly evolved intellect and yet lack moral development. He may be mentally quick and clever, he may possess much knowledge on many scientific subjects, and yet he may be vindictive, cruel and revengeful.

A man may be well educated and highly intelligent but not in the least spiritual. He may find by the roadside the unconscious victim of thugs and may be so intelligent that he can judge the exact extent of the injuries and how long the man will live. But if he drives on and leaves him to die there because he is a stranger then he is merely intellectual but not spiritual. An ignorant man may come that way later. He knows nothing of anatomy and fractured skulls. But if he lifts the unconscious man in his arms and takes him home with the hope of saving his life, he has proved that he has spirituality notwithstanding his lack of intellectual development.

The simple truth about our modern civiliza-

Without going into an analysis of the matter it is sufficient to say that everybody knows in a general way that if a man thinks kindly and tolerantly of another, making the best of all annoying situations, those men will live in peace. But if a man persistently thinks of another with dislike, if he permits every unpleasant incident to arouse in him the emotion of resentment against the other, he will finally come to hate him and quarrel with him. Either of these mental attitudes can be intensified, and as a matter of fact we are all, day by day, by our thoughts and emotions, helping to determine whether there shall be future peace or war. Whatever anybody can do to destroy either national or race prejudice and intolerance counts just that much for insuring peace.

Sometime ago one of the great editorial writers of the United States expressed the opinion that if France and Spain—which countries were at that time warring upon Morocco—were successful in conquering Morocco with great slaughter of its inhabitants, it would be a good thing for the world, because the more Arabs killed the better for the Occidental people when they should come to the war between the white nations of the Occident and the colored races of the Orient! That is characteristic plutocratic reasoning. First assume that war between the races is certain and then do your best to kill off those who might be

opposed to you if it does come! It is just that spirit of intolerance that is one of the prime causes of war. It is the sheerest nonsense to say that the white nations must unite for mutual protection against the Orientals. If simple justice is done everywhere there will be no need of protection against them. All human experience corroborates that fact. The most primitive and ignorant of the human race have always responded to brotherly treatment. That is true of the aborigines of every part of the earth. In this country William Penn had no trouble with the red men simply because he was a man of peace and justice. Only when other pioneers, probably moved by groundless fear, began treating the natives harshly, did conflict begin. Even the cruel Spaniards were kindly received everywhere from the Mississippi to Peru, and it was only after such fiends as Pizarro and Cortez committed their ghastly crimes against the inoffensive people, and the ruffian De Soto had betrayed the hospitality so freely offered him, that retaliation began. Race hatred and intolerance is a most fruitful cause of armed conflict and unfortunately one encounters it almost everywhere in the Occidental world.

The problem in government that now confronts the people in nearly every nation on the earth is to wrest political power from the plutocracy. A republic is only a step toward self-gov-

ernment. In a republic kings and barons disappear but a host of monopolies take their place. The power to control, to dictate, to take what is not earned; has merely passed to a larger number of people who get that power through the defective system of delegated authority.

In our colonial period there existed a form of real democracy—the New England town meeting, where every citizen could vote upon every measure proposed. As the population grew it became impossible to retain such a plan of government. But the evolution of civilization has brought us to the point where its re-introduction is practicable. That simple form of true democracy was possible in more primitive times because the entire community could be assembled in one audience and all could listen to the arguments and make a decision. Again today the miracles of invention have turned the entire American people into one vast audience that can listen to a speaker wherever he may be. By the use of the referendum as it is employed in Switzerland a direct vote of the entire population can be recorded upon any problem affecting the national welfare. That would be real democracy and it would ring the death knell of every form of political corruption.

We live in a period of changes, great and swift. More's dream of Utopia was but an inner glimpse

of a coming reality. There is that divine impulse within humanity that will yet achieve a sublimer environment for its continued evolution than philosophers have pictured or poets have dreamed. We shall return in future lives to a world without poverty, without disease, without armed conflict and without fear—a world of beauty, of leisure, of peace and tranquility, in which there is no longer conquests of nations but only conquests of nature as humanity moves to higher and higher levels of civilization in its search for reality and perfection. Our Southern poet, Kernan, caught an inspired glimpse of the evolutionary march. In imagination he saw the race escaping the tortures of the Inquisition, the degradation of capital punishment and the slavery of superstition; saw it leaving ignorance behind and passing through the gates of knowledge in the search for truth; saw the thrones of tyranny crumbling to dust; saw the scaffolds and dungeons disappear; saw the light of wisdom transforming the earth into a paradise and beheld a world in which the only royalty was the nobility of nature. And this is what he wrote:

Onward, upward press the peoples
To that pure exalted plane,
Where no throne shall cast a shadow
And no slave shall wear a chain.

They have trampled out the faggots,
Broken crucifix and wheel,
Banished rope and block and hemlock
And the headsman's bloody steel.

Forced the church hold to surrender
Stake and thong and bolt and bar;
Snatched the keys from off her girdle
Thrown the gates of truth ajar.

They have forced the titled tyrants
Human rights to recognize,
And with the lance of Knowledge
They have slain a legion lies.

Now they're lighting lamps of freedom
On a million altar stones,
From the torches they have kindled
At the blaze of burning thrones!

And that light shall sweep and circle
To the farthest ends of earth,
Touching with immortal beauty
Every heart and every hearth,

Thrilling every human being
Underneath the silent skies,
And transfiguring our planet
To a perfect paradise.

As they higher march and higher
On into the light serene,
Every man shall be a kaiser,
Every woman shall be a queen.

